Message

From: Barmakian, Nancy [Barmakian.Nancy@epa.gov]

Sent: 11/23/2020 3:28:56 PM

To: Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]

Subject: Re: Globe PFAS story

Yes - OPA involved. We are coordinating. Just wanted you to know we will need input on those high level programmatic questions. Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 23, 2020, at 10:20 AM, Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov> wrote:

fyi

Ed Messina, Esq.
Acting Office Director
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
p: (703) 347-0209

From: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>

Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 10:17 AM

To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>

Cc: Keigwin, Richard < Keigwin. Richard@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Globe PFAS story

Yes. We're awaiting further direction from OPA on our role in responding. I believe Region 1 is taking the lead and we'll be asked for input.

Greg Siedschlag

Chief, Communications Branch
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Phone: (703) 603-9044 Cell: (571) 319-7949 pronouns: he/him/his

From: Messina, Edward < Messina. Edward@epa.gov >

Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 10:11 AM

To: Dennis, Allison < Dennis. Allison@epa.gov >; Siedschlag, Gregory < Siedschlag. Gregory@epa.gov >

Cc: Keigwin, Richard < Keigwin. Richard@epa.gov >

Subject: FW: Globe PFAS story

Assuming this has made it your way. Might need some coordination with other program offices like OW and OLEM.

Ed

Ed Messina, Esq.
Acting Office Director
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
p: (703) 347-0209

From: Barmakian, Nancy <Barmakian.Nancy@epa.gov>

Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 10:02 AM

To: Messina, Edward < <u>Messina.Edward@epa.gov</u>>; Aubee, Catherine < <u>Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov</u>> **Cc:** McGuire, Karen < <u>Mcguire.Karen@epa.gov</u>>; Carr, Stephanie < <u>Carr.Stephanie@epa.gov</u>>; Deegan,

Dave < <u>Deegan.Dave@epa.gov</u>>; Hayes, Sharon < <u>Hayes.Sharon@epa.gov</u>>

Subject: FW: Globe PFAS story

Ed and Catherine,

See questions from Globe below. Dave Deegan from our press office sent these to OCSPP comms. We are assuming OCSPP will take the lead in answering these questions.

From: Deegan, Dave < <u>Deegan.Dave@epa.gov</u>>

Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 7:33 AM

To: Deziel, Dennis < <u>Deziel.Dennis@epa.gov</u>>; Szaro, Deb < <u>Szaro.Deb@epa.gov</u>>; Gutro, Doug < <u>Gutro.Doug@epa.gov</u>>; Norcross, Jeffrey < <u>Norcross.Jeffrey@epa.gov</u>>; McGuire, Karen < <u>McGuire.Karen@epa.gov</u>>

Cc: Grantham, Nancy <<u>Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov</u>>; Leifer, Kerry <<u>Leifer.Kerry@epa.gov</u>>; Dennis, Allison <<u>Dennis.Allison@epa.gov</u>>; Hull, George <<u>Hull.George@epa.gov</u>>; Drinkard, Andrea <<u>Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov</u>>; Siedschlag, Gregory <<u>Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov</u>>

Subject: Fwd: Globe PFAS story

Hi All, flagging for awareness Boston Globe inquiry below.

Assuming we will coordinate between HQ and region.

Dave

Dave Deegan
US EPA, Region 1
Office of Public Affairs
deegan.dave@epa.gov
617.918.1017 office
617.594.7068 iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Abel, David" < dabel@globe.com>
Date: November 22, 2020 at 6:14:43 PM EST

To: "Leifer, Kerry" < Leifer.Kerry@epa.gov >, "Deegan, Dave" < Deegan.Dave@epa.gov >

Subject: Globe PFAS story

Hi Kerry and Dave,

I hope all's well. I'm working on a potential story about elevated levels of PFAS found in Anvil, the insecticide Massachusetts and other states use to spray for EEE. Below is a table of findings from DEP, as well as a press release and other documents from PEER, urging the state to ban the use of the chemicals.

Just wondering if you could respond to these questions:

- -- Are these findings of PFAS in Anvil from the DEP concerning, and if so, why or why not?
- -- Should we be as concerned about forever chemicals (which don't degrade) being sprayed by air and truck entering drinking water and other water systems, and if so, why?
- -- Based on these findings, should the EPA or states ban the use of these chemicals, and if so, why or why not?

Thanks!

Best, David

Summary Table of PFAS Concentrations from MassDEP Anvil 10 + 10 Sampling:

Sample collection date	9/22	9/22	9/22	9/22	9/22	10/21	10/21	10/21	10/21		
Sample type	55 gal. drum 1	55	CONTROL:	2.5 gal.	sampling	55 1	55	55 gal.	Sampling		
		gal. drum	sampling	jug 1	device	gal. drum	gal. drum	drum	device		
		2	device rinse	(SAMPLE	rinse cntrl.	arum 1	arum 2	3 and	rinse cntrl. for		
		4	cntrl. for	3)	2.5 gal.	1	4	dupli- cate			
			55 gal.		jug 1			sample	55 gal. drum 1		
			drum 1		Jug I			Sample	and 2		
			and 2						and 2		
PFAS Compound	Concentration in nanograms per liter (ng/L) or part per trillion (ppt)										
Perfluorobutanoic Acid	692	171	ND	52.8 J	ND	716	174	230	ND		
(PFBA)			ND	ĺ				216	ND		
Perfluoro-3-Methoxypropanoic	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND		
Acid (PFMPA)			ND					ND	ND		
Perfluoropentanoic Acid	296	76.6	0.370 J	35.2 J	ND	290	55.4 J	88.7 J	ND		
(PFPeA)		J	ND					84.7 J	ND		
Perfluorobutanesulfonic Acid	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND		
(PFBS)			ND					ND	ND		
Perfluoro-4-Methoxybutanoic	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND		
Acid (PFMBA)			ND					ND	ND		
Perfluoro(2-	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND		
Ethoxyethane)Sulfonic Acid			ND					ND	ND		
(PFEESA)											
Nonafluoro-3,6-Dioxaheptanoic	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND		
Acid (NFDHA)			ND					ND	ND		
1H,1H,2H,2H-	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND		
Perfluorohexanesulfonic Acid			ND					ND	ND		
(4:2FTS)											

Perfluorohexanoic Acid	132	41.2	0.407 J	17.6 J	0.461 J	105	23.7 J	37.4 J	ND
(PFHxA)		J	ND					42.3 J	ND
Perfluoropentanesulfonic Acid	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
(PFPeS)			ND					ND	ND
2,3,3,3-Tetrafluoro-2-	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
[1,1,2,2,3,3,3-			ND		1			ND	ND
Heptafluoropropoxy]-Propanoic									
Acid (HFPO-DA)		ļ							
Perfluoroheptanoic Acid	53.4 J	23.6	ND	ND	ND	47.6 J	ND	ND	ND
(PFHpA)		L.	ND					19.2 J	ND
Perfluorohexanesulfonic Acid	ND	ND	ND	52.8 J	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
(PFHxS)			ND					ND	ND
4,8-Dioxa-3h-	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Perfluorononanoic Acid			ND					ND	ND
(ADONA)						ļ			~~~~~
1Н,1Н,2Н,2Н-	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	29.8 J	31.6 J	27.6 J	ND
Perfluorooctanesulfonic Acid			ND					28.9 J	ND
(6:2FTS)									
Perfluorooctanoic Acid	25.7 J	ND	ND	ND	ND	21.8 J	ND	ND	ND
(PFOA)		<u> </u>	ND					ND	ND
Perfluoroheptanesulfonic Acid	107	100	ND	125	ND	ND	98.9	63.0 J	ND
(PFHpS)			ND					52.0 J	ND
Perfluorononanoic Acid (PFNA)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
			ND					ND	ND
Perfluorooctanesulfonic Acid	73.1 J	ND	ND	76.2 J	2.73	ND	ND	ND	3.31
(PFOS)			ND					ND	ND
9-Chlorohexadecafluoro-3-	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Oxanone-1-Sulfonic Acid (9Cl-			ND					ND	ND
PF3ONS)		<u> </u>							
1H,1H,2H,2H-	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Perfluorodecanesulfonic Acid			ND					ND	ND
(8:2FTS)									
Perfluorodecanoic Acid (PFDA)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
			ND					ND	ND
Perfluoroundecanoic Acid	13.8 J	ND	ND	21.5 J	ND	184	ND	ND	ND
(PFUnA)			ND					ND	ND
11-Chloroeicosafluoro-3-	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Oxaundecane-1-Sulfonic Acid			ND					ND	ND
(11Cl-PF3OUdS)									
Perfluorododecanoic Acid	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
(PFDoA)			ND					ND	ND

Table notes: ND = not detected; J = estimated value; Tube rinse cntrl. = sampling device rinsates performed at sampling site prior to sample collect assess any sampling device contamination. All field and trip blanks were generally non-detect and are not presented. In one, PFOS was detected at

All samples were analyzed by Alpha Analytical, Mansfield, MA. using a modified version of EPA Method 533. Stated reporting limits for product same were below 100 ng/L with detection limits ranging from approximately 5-50 ng/L depending on the analyte. QA/QC issues were appropriately not Alpha Analytical in the lab reports but all QA/QC elements have not been fully reviewed by MassDEP at this time.

The September and October samples were collected by two different contractors using new sampling devices. The October 2.5 gallon jug samples valued into the sample collection tubes.

Initial samples that were collected on 9/2 are not presented. These were invalidated because appropriate field controls were not collected by the contractor and results were consistent with samples being contaminated during collection. In that round, five to thirteen PFAS were detected in duanalyses of the single drum 1 sample collected, with a maximum concentration of 25 ug/L (25,000 ppt) for PFBA.

David Abel

Reporter
The Boston Globe

dabel@globe.com
Follow on Twitter @davabel
See my bio here, films here, and recent stories
here